

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed February 22, 2007, considered and rejected claims 1-31. Claims 1-6, 12-16, 18-19, 26 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Charlet et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0160108). Claims 7-8, 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Charlet et al.* as applied respectively to claims 9 and 19 above, and further in view of *Dorsett, Jr.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,658,429). Claims 11 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Charlet et al.* as applied respectively to claims 1 and 18 above, and further in view of *Russell et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0039964). Claims 9, 17, 24, 25, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Charlet et al.* as applied respectively to claims 6, 13 and 18 above, and further in view of *Meltzer et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,125,391).

By this response, each of the independent claims has been amended similarly to better clarify the invention. In particular, the independent claims now recite that a conversion is performed from an anonymous construct in a markup language domain to a construct in an object oriented language domain. For example, an anonymous XML construct can be converted to an object. As defined in the claims, this is performed by assigning an introduce field to represent the anonymous first construct in the object domain. An example of this type of conversion is provided beginning on page 13, line 22 of the specification. As shown in this example, the anonymous construct is a sequence element in XML that includes an unbounded constraint. See Claim 2. This is converted into the two classes (i.e. objects) that are shown on page 14, lines 15-25. See Claim 3. In this example, "temporary_field_name" is the introduce field.

As can be seen, a primary benefit of the invention is to enable the deserialization of anonymous elements in XML (or other markup languages) to object oriented constructs (such as objects). Applicant submits that none of the cited art, whether singly or in combination discloses anything similar to converting anonymous constructs in a markup language to constructs in an object oriented language.

The primary reference, Charlet, is not related to the mapping of XML to objects. In contrast, Charlet relates to mapping XML to relational data. As such, Charlet is no longer relevant to the independent claims. For example, to reject previous claim 4 which contained

limitations specifically directed to objects, the rejection cites paragraph 67 of Charlet. This paragraph, however, discusses a standard user interface and is unrelated to the conversion of XML to objects.

The only remaining reference that is relevant to the amended independent claims is the Russell reference. Russell is only relevant because it describes embodiments for converting XML to objects. However, Russell fails to disclose anything relevant to converting anonymous XML constructs into objects in general, or more specifically, to converting "the anonymous first construct of the XML domain to the second construct of the object domain by assigning an introduce field to represent the anonymous first construct in the object domain;" as required by each independent claim. Applicant therefore submits that the independent claims are novel and non-obvious in view of the cited art and respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 322-8427.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any of the following fees that may be applicable to this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-3178: (1) any filing fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16; and/or (2) any patent application and reexamination processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17; and/or (3) any post issuance fees under 37 CFR § 1.20. In addition, if any additional extension of time is required, which has not otherwise been requested, please consider this a petition therefore and charge any additional fees that may be required to Deposit Account No. 23-3178.

Dated this 13th day of December, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

/BRIAN D. TUCKER/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
BRIAN D. TUCKER
Registration No. 61,550
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:BDT:jmb
3150275_1.DOC